



Indiana Pro Bono Commission
230 East Ohio Street, Suite 200
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Indiana Bar Foundation
230 East Ohio Street, Suite 200
Indianapolis, IN 46204

COMBINED 2003 DISTRICT REPORT, 2005 PRO BONO GRANT APPLICATION, AND 2005 PLAN

Pro Bono District 14

Applicant: AMY W. ROTH

Mailing Address: 1307 EAST ELM STREET

City: NEW ALBANY, IN **Zip:** 47150

Phone: 812-949-2292 **Fax:** 812-945-5787

E-mail address: probono14@earthlink.net **Website address:**

Judicial Appointee: The Honorable J. Terrence Cody

Plan Administrator: AMY W. ROTH

Names of Counties served: CLARK, CRAWFORD, FLOYD, HARRISON, ORANGE, SCOTT, WASHINGTON

Number of registered attorneys in county: Clark: 136; Crawford: 5; Floyd: 148; Harrison: 30; Orange: 13; Scott: 16; Washington: 20 in district: 368

Percentage of volunteer attorneys who accepted a pro bono case in 2003 per registered attorneys in county: Clark: 24.3%; Crawford: 0; Floyd: 31.1%; Harrison: 23.3%; Orange: 0; Scott: 31.3%; Washington: 25.0% in district: 26.1%

Percentage of volunteer attorneys who have not yet accepted a pro bono case in 2003 per registered attorneys in county: Clark: 22.1%; Crawford: 0; Floyd: 25.0%; Harrison: 16.6%; Orange: 15.4%; Scott: 18.8%; Washington: 20.0% in district: 22.0%

Amount of grant received for 2004: \$21,280.00

Amount of grant (2003 & prior years) projected to be unused as of 12/31/04:

 0

Amount requested for 2005: \$26,660

PRO BONO DISTRICT NUMBER <u> 14 </u> LETTER OF REPRESENTATION

The following representations, made to the best of our knowledge and belief, are being provided to the Indiana Pro Bono Commission and Indiana Bar Foundation in anticipation of their review and evaluation of our funding request and our commitment and value to our Pro Bono District.

Operation under Rule 6.5

In submitting this application for funding, this district is representing itself as having a Pro Bono Plan, which is pursuant to Rule 6.5 of the Indiana Rules of Professional Conduct. The plan enables attorneys in our district to discharge their professional responsibilities to provide civil legal pro bono services; improves the overall delivery of civil legal services to persons of limited means by facilitating the integration and coordination of services provided by pro bono organizations and other legal assistance organizations in our district; and ensures access to high quality and timely pro bono civil legal services for persons of limited means by (1) fostering the development of new civil legal pro bono programs where needed and (2) supporting and improving the quality of existing civil legal pro bono programs. The plan also fosters the growth of a public service culture within our district which values civil legal pro bono publico service and promotes the ongoing development of financial and other resources for civil legal pro bono organizations.

We have adhered to Rule 6.5 (f) by having a district pro bono committee composed of:

- A. the judge designated by the Supreme Court to preside;
- B. to the extent feasible, one or more representatives from each voluntary bar association in the district, one representative from each pro bono and legal assistance provider in the district, and one representative from each law school in the district; and
- C. at least two (2) community-at-large representatives, one of whom shall be a present or past recipient of pro bono publico legal services.

We have determined the governance of our district pro bono committee as well as the terms of service of our members. Replacement and succession members are appointed by the judge designated by the Supreme Court.

Pursuant to Rule 6.5 (g) to ensure an active and effective district pro bono program, we:

- A. prepare in written form, on an annual basis, a district pro bono plan, including any county sub-plans if appropriate, after evaluating the needs of the district and making a determination of presently available pro bono services;
- B. select and employ a plan administrator to provide the necessary coordination and administrative support for the district pro bono committee;
- C. implement the district pro bono plan and monitor its results;
- D. submit an annual report to the Commission; and

- E. forward to the Pro Bono Commission for review and consideration any requests which were presented as formal proposals to be included in the district plan but were rejected by the district committee, provided the group asks for review by the Pro Bono Commission.

Commitment to Pro Bono Program Excellence

We also understand that ultimately the measure of success for a civil legal services program, whether a staffed or volunteer attorney program, is the outcomes achieved for clients, and the relationship of these outcomes to clients' most critical legal needs. We agree to strive for the following hallmarks which are characteristics enhancing a pro bono program's ability to succeed in providing effective services addressing clients' critical needs.

- 1. Participation by the local bar associations and attorneys.** The associations and attorneys believe the program is necessary and beneficial.
- 2. Centrality of client needs.** The mission of the program is to provide high quality free civil legal services to low-income persons through volunteer attorneys. Client needs drive the program, balanced by the nature and quantity of resources available.
- 3. Program priorities.** The program engages in a priority-setting process, which determines what types of problems the program will address. Resources are allocated to matters of greatest impact on the client and are susceptible to civil legal resolution. The program calls on civil legal providers and other programs serving low-income people to assist in this process.
- 4. Direct representation component.** The core of the program is direct representation in which volunteer attorneys engage in advocacy on behalf of low-income persons. Adjunct programs such as advice clinics, pro se clinics and paralegal assistance are dictated by client needs and support the core program.
- 5. Coordination with state and local civil legal providers and bar associations.** The programs work cooperatively with the local civil legal providers. The partnerships between the civil legal providers and the local bar association results in a variety of benefits including sharing of expertise, coordination of services, and creative solutions to problems faced by the client community.
- 6. Accountability.** The program has mechanisms for evaluating the quality of service it provides. It expects and obtains reporting from participating attorneys concerning the progress/outcome of referred cases. It has the capability to demonstrate compliance with requirements imposed by its funding source(s), and it has a grievance procedure for the internal resolution of disputes between attorneys and clients.
- 7. Continuity.** The program has a form of governance, which ensures the program will survive changes in bar leadership, and has operational guidelines, which enable the program to survive a change in staff.
- 8. Cost-effectiveness.** The program maximizes the level of high quality civil legal services it provides in relationship to the total amount of funding received.

9. Minimization of barriers. The program addresses in a deliberate manner linguistic, sensory, physical and cultural barriers to clients' ability to receive services from the program. The program does not create undue administrative barriers to client access.

10. Understanding of ethical considerations. The program operates in a way which is consistent with the Rules of Professional Conduct; client confidentiality is assured and conflicts of interest are avoided. The staff and volunteers are respectful of clients and sensitive to their needs.

11. ABA Standards. The program is designed to be as consistent with the ABA Standards for Programs Providing Civil Pro Bono Legal Services to Persons of Limited Means as possible.

No events, shortages or irregularities have occurred and no facts have been discovered which would make the financial statements provided to you materially inaccurate or misleading. To our knowledge there is nothing reflecting unfavorably upon the honesty or integrity of members of our organization. We have accounted for all known or anticipated operating revenue and expense in preparing our funding request.

We agree to provide human-interest stories promoting Pro Bono activities in a timely manner upon request of the Indiana Bar Foundation or Indiana Pro Bono Commission. We further agree to make ourselves available to meet with the Pro Bono Commission and/or the Indiana Bar Foundation to answer any questions or provide any material requested which serves as verification/source documentation for the submitted information.

Explanation of items stricken from the above Letter of Representation:

It is understood that this Letter does not replace the Grant Agreement or other documents required by the Indiana Bar Foundation or Indiana Pro Bono Commission.

Signatures:

Judicial Appointee Signature

Date

Plan Administrator Signature

Date

2005 PLAN SUMMARY

1. **Please write a brief summary of the 2005 grant request. Please include information regarding your district's planned activities. The grant request should cover needs to be addressed, methods, target audience, anticipated outcomes, and how past difficulties will be addressed.**

District 14's major challenge for 2005 is to keep the doors of the program open for business. Our financial support comes from the IOLTA monies, donations, some smaller grants of restricted money for litigation expenses, and program grants from local sources. With a one-person staff, it is almost impossible to manage the client casework well and add the responsibilities of raising money. Grant applications are time-consuming and basically self-defeating in that the granting organizations mostly want to see new thrusts and new directions in existing programs, another near-impossibility when the basic needs stay steady in their nature but increase in numbers. We have developed several long-range plans (5-year, and 10-year), but the one-year plan is to stay in business.

Assuming that this can be done, we have a number of projects planned: a CLE on family law planned for December of 2004 should carry some momentum over into 2005 in the form of new attorneys signing up for pro bono work, the necessity to monitor carefully all those who attend the CLE for a reduced fee and a promise to take some pro bono cases, and a continuing effort to make Legal Volunteers "user-friendly" for participating attorneys. This latter needs to take the form of making attorneys feel that help is available when they need it—mentoring help, litigation funds, the assurance that they need not be anyone's pro bono lawyer *in perpetuity*, which some of our clients take for granted.

In addition, we are overdue for a **formal** recognition event for our attorneys. They are thanked individually both at the outset of a case and when it closes, but the last recognition event was very specific as to who did the most hours, etc., and engendered some complaints from attorneys who feel that pro bono contributions are not necessarily quantifiable in that manner. These problems can be overcome and the event will probably be in early 2005.

We have applied for an American College of Bankruptcy grant for 2005, with an assurance from Legal Services that they can refer at least two pre-screened bankruptcy clients per month. This grant will pay the non-waivable filing fee of \$209 for pro bono bankruptcy clients and will help to alleviate some of the backlog of clients who are desperately trying to save up enough money to file bankruptcy—an almost impossible task for most. Legal Volunteers is currently recruiting enough attorneys who, in addition to their regular pro bono work, will agree to do one pro bono bankruptcy per year.

Basically, however, our main target audience is, and will continue to be, those in need of assistance in family law issues, particularly abused women, custody and visitation disputes, guardianships, and support issues; these needs are increasing as we progress through 2004, and there is no reason to anticipate that the numbers will decrease next year. By continuing to focus our attention on giving help where it is needed most and making every effort to assure that the match between client and attorney is compatible, we strive for success in 2005. We are dealing with a segment of the population that has every reason to feel downtrodden and depressed—little money to live on, difficult and frequently abusive relationships, low self-esteem—

so of course there will be problems along the way, but our attorneys have proven to be amazingly patient and helpful in these relationships.

One further difficulty is a logistical one, and one that is doubtless faced by many non-profit organizations. It is very difficult to motivate our board **out** of the mentality of thinking of themselves as an “advisory” board, and **into** the mentality of becoming “doers”—this in a time when precious few people have the time to “do”. We have been blessed with several who will step up as needed, but it is difficult at best to get many even to attend bi-monthly meetings. This effort will continue in 2005, and is basically one of building relationships and then motivating members into working in areas where they are interested and have expertise.

2003 REPORT OF VOLUNTEER LAWYER CASES IN DISTRICT __14__

Please attach additional pages for each pro bono provider that receives IOLTA funding, whether directly or indirectly, in your district. See the sample additional pro bono provider page 6A. Please list each attorney only once in the volunteer lawyer column but complete one line for each pro bono case for that attorney.

Definitions:

Case: A legal matter referred to and accepted by a pro bono attorney volunteer.

Volunteer Lawyer: An attorney who has rendered pro bono service to at least one low-income client during the year or accepted a pro bono referral from the identified program. This does not include attorneys who are on the list of pro bono volunteers but who have never taken a case. The case numbers do not include cases screened, only cases actually referred to a pro bono attorney.

Case Type: Please use the abbreviations listed in Indiana Supreme Court Administrative Rule 8(B)(3)

Name of Pro Bono Provider (includes legal service provider, court, plan administrator, bar association, and other organizations): _____LEGAL VOLUNTEERS_OF JUDICIAL DISTRICT 14_

IOLTA funding accounts for _43_ % of total pro bono provider budget.

Volunteer Lawyer Name	County	Year Case Accepted	Year Case Closed	Number of Hours	Case Type
ADAMS, D.	CLARK	03	OPEN		GU
BALLARD, F.	CLARK	02	03	5	MI
BARTLETT, R.	CLARK	03	03	12.5	GU
BATES, D.	CL	03	03	2	AD
BERTRAND, J.	CL	02	03	15	DR
	CL	02	03	17	DR
	CL	03	03	15	DR
	CL	03	03	15	DR
	CL	03	OPEN		DR
CARMICHAEL, V	CL	02	03	22	DR
	CL	03	OPEN	2 (03)	DR
CARPENTER, C.	CL	02	03	5	DR
COOPER, L.	CL	02	03	8	DR
	CL	03	03	1	MI
	CL	03	03	10	DR
SEE EXTRA SHEETS	FOR TOTAL	BY CTY	AND	OVERALL	TOTALS

INFORMATION ACTIVITY IN DISTRICT 14

in or walk-in informational services.

whether directly or indirectly, in your district. See the sample additional pro bono provider page 7A. Please list each attorney only once in the volunteer lawyer column but complete one line for each type of legal information activity for that attorney.

bar association, and other organizations): _____LEGAL VOLUNTEERS_____

[illegible]

2003 REPORT

Please list your District's 2003 activities--including committee meetings, training, attorney recognition, marketing and promotion--in chronological order.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Activity</u>
Feb.	Board Meeting
March	Executive Board Meeting
May	Board Meeting
July	Board Meeting Marketing Committee meeting to discuss general strategy Grant application submitted to United Way (granted)
Sept.	Board Meeting Exec. Committee to discuss fiduciary issues Training on financial management (administrator) Grant application submitted to Caesar's Foundation Floyd County (granted)
Oct.	Administrator to IN Bar Association meeting for Plan Administrator Retreat
Nov.	Board Meeting Brochure revision committee Finance committee to discuss personnel review and salary Training on business plans (administrator)

Please provide a short summary of how the provision of pro bono service is coordinated in your district, including the intake process, the relationships of pro bono providers in the district, how referrals are made, and how reporting is done.

District 14's pro bono needs are served solely by Legal Volunteers. For the first several years after the implementation of Rule 6.5, this program "lived" with Legal Services, depended on Legal Services for its intakes, and also existed under the fiduciary arm and 501(c)(3) umbrella of Legal Services. The relationship with Legal Services was, and continues to be, warm and collegial, and they depend on this relationship as they refer the bulk of their meritorious divorce cases to Legal Volunteers; however, Legal Volunteers has now moved physically away from Legal Services and has a new fiduciary in the Community Foundation of Southern Indiana. When Legal Services refers cases, they are closed on their data base and therefore become the sole responsibility of Legal Volunteers, whereas in the previous arrangement cases stayed open even though they were being handled by the pro bono side, and at closing were reported back to Legal Services. All the open files moved with the program and are gradually being closed out. Legal Volunteers has always kept detailed records internally, and this not only continues, but the data is reported to the Board.

Legal Volunteers referrals are handled on an individual basis, making sure that attorneys are asked to take on cases only in the areas where they prefer to practice. Any questions are handled up front via email or phone. We try not to overburden any one person and realize that a difficult divorce/custody case can go on well past a year. Attorneys are asked to report back at closing, and the hours are recorded then.

Please describe any special circumstances, including difficulties encountered, affecting your District's 2003 implementation of its plan.

This administrator started work in January 2003, with very little orientation, so the first few months were devoted to learning the job, meeting people, and becoming familiar with the legal community and its workings. As noted previously, one difficulty has been a Board that is warm, friendly, accepting, etc., but which did not and does not understand that they need to be more involved. They give lip service to the idea that a one-person staff can't do everything and should not have to raise money, but they make no move to help alleviate this situation. This is of course a two-way street and needs to be addressed on both sides.

The other difficulty has been the Board's—and the Judiciary's—resistance to pro se forms and to educating people to their use. There are circumstances where these can be very useful, and the stark truth is that we do not have enough pro bono attorneys to handle all the meritorious applications. The flood of abused women we encounter makes it almost impossible to handle just a routine, no children, no assets, divorce—this was true in 2002, it was true in 2003, and it is certainly holding true in 2004. This is a project of education and preparation, using Anthony Zapata's excellent material, which needs to get more attention.

Cost Category	2003 actual expendi- tures	2003 Budget (Rev)	2004 actual expendi- tures (Est)	2004 Budget (Rev)	2005 Budget
A. Personnel Costs					
1. Plan Adminis- trator	19563	14640	16818	16818	23000
2. Paralegals					
3. Others					
4. Employee benefits	1497	1120	1287	1287	1760
a. Insurance					
b. Retirement plans					
c. Other					
5. Total Person- nel Costs	21060	15760	18105	18105	24760
B. Non- Personnel Costs					
1. Occupancy			375	600	600
2. Equipment rental			0	0	0
3. Office supplies			1600 **	925	300
4. Telephone			1000	1000	
5. Travel	50	1800	120	250	250
6. Training	120	600	50	200	200
7. Library					
8. Malpractice insurance					
9. Dues and fees	50	120	50	75	50
10. Audit					
11. Contingent re- serve			200	200	500
12. Litigation re- serve					
13. Marketing and promotion					
14. Attorney recognition					
15. Litigation Expenses (in- cludes expert fees)					
16. Property Acquisition					

17. Contract Services					
18. Grants to other pro bono providers					
19. Other					
20. Total Non-Personnel Costs	220	2520	3195	3175	1900
C. Total Expenditures	21280	21280	21300	21280	26660

IOLTA funds received 2003: \$ _21,280_ IOLTA funds received 2004: \$ _21,280__

Budget Narrative

Please provide descriptions of the following line items in the foregoing budget chart, by item number, in the space provided.

Lines (A)(1), (2), (3) Please indicate the number of hours per week for each personnel position and rate of pay.

_(A)(1) _Administrator is full-time, at about 38-40 hours per week. Differential in pay is made up with donated and grant monies (non-renewable)—total annual pay is \$31,500, with no perquisites.

(2) _There is no paralegal.

(3) _Part-time assistant worked from February into May at \$10 an hour. Maximum time per week was 5 hours. _She was paid from donated funds, not IOLTA funds.____

Line (B)(1) Please describe the occupancy cost in terms of square footage, utilities or other amenities and indicate whether the occupancy cost is above or below the market rate for that space.

On May 15, 2004, the Legal Volunteers program moved into a small office at a local church. We are using only the desk that was in that office. All other furniture was purchased or donated, which accounts for the high office supplies expenditure for 2004. Rent is \$50 per month, and is considered a “donation” to cover the utility costs. This is well below market rate for space in this area. The program owns a computer and paid for a phone line to be run in.

ANNUAL TIMETABLE FOR SUBMISSION OF FORMS AND CHECKS:

January 1:	Checks distributed
July 1:	Annual report, plan and grant application due to IPBC
November:	Notification of awards
December 1:	IBF grant agreement due and revised budget due

Volunteer Lawyer Name	County	Year Case Accep- ted	Year Case Closed	Number of Hours	Case Type
CUMMINS, R.	CL	02	03	10	DR
DAWKINS, W.	CL	02	04	40 (IN 03)	DR
DESIMONE, J.	CL	02	03	16	DR
	CL	02	03	37.25	DR
FONDRISI, M.	CL	02	OPEN	16 (IN 03)	DR
FORSEE, M.	CL	03	OPEN		DR
FOWLER, A.	CL	02	03	34.50	DR
	CL	02	03	1	DR
GILLENWATER, M.	CL	02	OPEN		DR
GLICKFIELD, L.	CL	03	OPEN		DR
	CL	03	03	5	DR
GREEN, G.	CL	02	04	10 (03)	DR
GREEN, S.	CL	03	03	1	MI
GUILFOYLE, C.	CL	02	03	1	MI
JACOBS, B.	CL	03	OPEN		DR
LOCKARD, R.	CL	03	OPEN		DR
LOWE, T.	CL	03	OPEN		AD
MARRA, D.	CL	02	OPEN		DR
	CL	02	OPEN		MI
MERKLEY, L.	CL	02	OPEN		DR
MOORE, D.	CL	03	OPEN		DR
MOSLEY, D.	CL	03	OPEN		MI
MULL, K.	CL	02	03	22	GU
SMITH, E.W.	CL	02	03	2	ES
	CL	03	03	1	MI
THOMPSON, P.	CL	03	03	3	ES
THOMAS, T.	CL	01	03	14.50	DR
VOELKER, S.	CL	02	03	6	DR
WILDER, L.	CL	02	OPEN		DR
WILLIAMS, J.	CL	03	03	20	MI

Volunteer Lawyer Name	County	Year Case Accepted	Year Case Closed	Number of Hours	Case Type
BETTEAU, B.	FLOYD	02	03	6	DR
BIERLY, R.	▼	02	OPEN		PL
BIRD, T.	▼	03	OPEN		DR
BOURNE, J.	▼	02	03	1	MI
	▼	03	OPEN		DR
CONRAD, M.	▼	03	OPEN		DR
CONRAD, K.	▼	03	OPEN		DR
COTNER, L.	▼	03	03	10	DR
DOANE, K.	▼	03	03	13	DR
FIFER, G.	▼	03	03	3.5	MI
FOX, R.	▼	02	03	13	DR
GESENHUES, G.	▼	02	03	5.25	DR
	▼	02	03	6.10	DR
	▼	03	03	18.50	DR
	▼	03	OPEN		DR
GOODWELL, K.	▼	03	03	6	MI
HAINES, S.	▼	03	03	9.75	ES
	▼	03	03	1	ES
HAMILTON, R. P.	▼	02	03	4	MI
	▼	03	03	3	MI
LOHMEYER, S.	▼	02	03	3	MI
LORCH, L.	▼	01	03	13	DR
	▼	03	03	11	DR
	▼	03	03	1	DR
LOWE, J.	▼	03	OPEN		MI
MATTOX, F.	▼	03	OPEN		DR
MOYER, W.	▼	02	OPEN		MI
MURPHY, C.	▼	03	OPEN		MI
NAVILLE, M.	▼	02	03	4.5	GU
NEELY, G.	▼	02	03	11	ES
	▼	03	03	2	ES
	▼	03	03	7	DR
PALMQUIST, S.	▼	03	03	3.8	GU
PLATT, C.	▼	03	OPEN		DR

Volunteer Lawyer Name	County	Year Case Accepted	Year Case Closed	Number of Hours	Case Type
PLATT, C.	FLOYD	03	OPEN		DR
PRICE, G.	▼	03	03	15.40	MI
PULLIAM, K.	▼	03	03	5	GU
	▼	03	03	15	CC
REGER, G.	▼	02	03	6	DR
	▼	02	03	25	DR
	▼	03	03	5	DR
	▼	03	03	7	MI
REGER, L.	▼	03	03	9.85	DR
	▼	03	03	4	GU
RENFRO, K.	▼	02	03	4.25	DR
	▼	03	OPEN		DR
ROBINSON, M.	▼	02	03	6	DR
	▼	03	03	6	DR
ROBISON, S.	▼	03	OPEN		DR
RUSH, R.	▼	01	03	17	DR
	▼	02	03	5	DR
	▼	02	03	6	DR
SCHAD, L.	▼	02	03	20	DR
	▼	02	03	10	DR
	▼	03	OPEN		DR
SCHAD, M.	▼	03	OPEN		DR
SINEX, T.	▼	03	03	1	GU
	▼	03	OPEN		ES
SMITH, W. III	▼	02	03	5.5	DR
	▼	03	OPEN		DR
STILLER, C.	▼	02	03	47.20	DR
	▼	03	OPEN		DR
STRECKFUS, G.	▼	03	03	1	GU
	▼	03	OPEN		DR
SUMMERS, M.	▼	02	03	1	JP
TAURMAN, K.	▼	02	03	6.50	MI
THOMAS, S.	▼	03	03	2	DR
	▼	03	OPEN		DR

Volunteer Lawyer Name	County	Year Case Accepted	Year Case Closed	Number of Hours	Case Type
WELCH, L.	FLOYD	03	03	4	DR
	▼	03	OPEN		DR
WILLIAMS, S.	▼	03	03	40	GU
WILLIS, V.	▼	03	03	7.70	ES
WOODARD, J.	▼	03	03	3.75	GU
AUSTIN, M.	HARRISON	02	03	4	MI
FINK, L.	▼	03	03	8	DR
HARRIS, R.	▼	03	OPEN		DR
INGLE, G.	▼	02	03	7	DR
	▼	02	03	6	MI
LAYSON, D.	▼	02	03	6	MI
SCHULTZ, S.	▼	03	OPEN		DR
SWARENS, E.	▼	03	03	11	MI
CARTER, M.	SCOTT	02	03	2	DR
DIETRICH, J.	▼	03	03	10	DR
	▼	03	03	2	DR
	▼	03	OPEN		MI
HOUSTON, R.	▼	01	03	8	MI
	▼	03	OPEN		MI
RANDALL, R.	▼	02	03	3	DR
THOMPSON, K.	▼	02	03	2.5	GU
	▼	03	OPEN		DR
BRISCOE, D.	WASH.	02	03	10	DR
	▼	03	OPEN		DR
LEATHERBURY, D.	▼	02	03	.5	MI
	▼	03	03	4.50	DR
	▼	03	OPEN		DR
MEAD, J.	▼	03	OPEN	14.6 (03)	EU
SCIFRES, T.**	▼	03	03	41.2	DR
THOMPSON, T.	▼	03	OPEN		DR
**INSTRUMENTAL IN	ORGANIZING	WASH.	CTY.	ATTYS.	

**TOTAL HOURS: CLARK COUNTY: 369.75
CRAWFORD: 0
FLOYD: 442.55
HARRISON: 42
**ORANGE: 0
SCOTT: 27.5
WASHINGTON: 70.8**

OVERALL: 952.6 HOURS

****LEGAL SERVICES IN NEW ALBANY HANDLES ALL THE COUNTIES IN DISTRICT 14 EXCEPT ORANGE, WHERE THE INTAKE APPLICATIONS ARE PROCESSED IN BLOOMINGTON. SINCE LEGAL VOLUNTEERS HAS HERETOFORE DEPENDED HEAVILY ON LEGAL SERVICES FOR REFERRALS, THERE HAVE BEEN NONE FROM ORANGE. THIS SITUATION SHOULD CHANGE AS WE MOVE MORE INTO INDEPENDENT INTAKE IN OUR NEW AND INDEPENDENT OFFICE.**